
MEMORANDUM



DATE: June 13, 1997

TO: Ina Petokis
San Bernardino County Planning Department
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0182

FROM: Brad Mettam, Special Projects Coordinator
Inyo County Planning Department

RE: Proposed Intermodal Transshipment of Low-level Radioactive
Waste Destined for the Nevada Test Site

CC: Peter Chamberlin, Director of Planning

I met with representatives from Clark and Lincoln Counties (Nevada) on June 4th, followed later that day by a meeting of the Department of Energy Nevada Test Site Transportation Protocol Working Group (a group that meets regularly to improve communication between DOE-NTS and stakeholders concerned with transportation). At both meetings the issue of intermodal transfer sites was discussed.

I have included a copy of comments on the proposed site selection study and a map of the proposed locations, both prepared by Clark County and distributed at the meeting. You will note that the actual transfer location is not Baker, but the Santa Fe and UP rail interline facility at (or near) Barstow. This would require legal weight truck travel on I15 to Baker, then travelling on SR127 to the California-Nevada State line. The shipments will then continue on Nevada SR373 to US95 and south on US95 to the Mercury entrance to the Nevada Test Site.

These shipments are currently travelling southwest on I15 into Las Vegas from the east, continuing north on US95 to the Mercury entrance to the Nevada Test Site. Under the current routing the shipments do not enter California. These shipments were addressed in the DOE Fernald, Ohio Environmental Impact Statement, although I do not know if specific routes were examined. DOE-NTS has stated they will review the need for additional environmental documentation to comply with NEPA if intermodal shipments become the normal shipment method from Fernald. You should note that Fernald is only one of the locations shipping defense low-level radioactive waste for disposal at the NTS.

My impression from discussions with the Nevada counties is that they would prefer to select the transfer site at Caliente. However, they want the site selection to "be consistent with the best practice in transportation and environmental analysis". They hope to set a precedent for the inclusion of community acceptance in DOE siting decisions — and Caliente wants the transfer site. This does, however, not preclude the selection of the Barstow location. The State of Nevada stated as a matter of policy that they would not support any shipment mode that has material travelling through the Las Vegas Valley, either by truck or rail. This would still leave either the Caliente transfer site, or the Barstow transfer site (if shipments arrived on the Santa Fe line).

To the best of my knowledge, no one has yet looked at the Barstow location, or contacted the railroads to inquire about intermodal facilities. That would be a part of this study.

CLARK COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING, NUCLEAR WASTE DIVISION
500 SOUTH GRAND CENTRAL PARKWAY, SUITE 3012, LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89106

MEMORANDUM FROM RUSSELL di BARTOLO

Telephone: 702-455-5591; FAX: 702-455-5190; e-mail: rdb@co.clark.nv.us

TO: Frank DeSanza, DOE Nevada
SUBJECT: Comments on the Proposed DOE Demonstration Project Transfer Site Selection Study
DATE: 03 June 1997

We have reviewed the study proposal entitled, "Intermodal Transportation Demonstration Transfer-Point Site Selection," prepared by DOE/NV. This proposal was prepared after discussion on Wednesday, 28 May, among Frank DeSanza, Fred Dilger, Pete Cummings, Bruce Stolte and Russell di Bartolo.

At the meeting, we agreed that DOE must be able to show how they arrived at the decision to choose a particular site for the demonstration. We suggested that DOE would be well served if they conducted a feasibility and safety study that would compare a number of sites on mutually agreed-upon and meaningful factors [to non-technical decision-makers]. A demonstration at the selected site would be part of this approach. The process would serve as a preliminary systems analysis with the results used not only to choose a site for the demonstration but also to obtain information on the costs, feasibility and safety of the intermodal approach. We feel that this process would be acceptable to local government decision-makers and could provide a solid basis for involvement of stakeholders in this and other DOE decisions.

Our specific comments are as follows:

1. Change the title of the project to "Preliminary Systems Analysis of the Intermodal Transportation of Low-Level Radioactive Waste: Feasibility and Safety."
2. Reorder the criteria as follows:
 - *[Added] Preliminary Identification of Potential Sidings or Sites* [This has already been completed by DOE as they selected four sites to be compared. At this point, each site needs to be described in terms of the following factors, and others if used].
 - availability and accessibility of suitable area and infrastructure for transfer operations [minimal standards to be specified].
 - proximity and accessibility to roadway [maximum distance and statutory authority to be specified]
 - *Screening Criterion*
 - community acceptance [this was the wording used in the meeting] - as demonstrated by previous interactions, meeting notes, other records [need to identify official representatives of communities; for this analysis, may identify PWG members and others, e.g., San Bernadino County reps].
Note: San Bernadino County officials have been kept abreast of developments by Inyo County representative of PWG and may wish to participate more fully if they deem it appropriate].

Intermodal Prototype Routes

